

REMARKS

Favorable consideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully solicited.

Claims 1-11, 13, 14, 16-26, 28, 29, 31 and 35-43 remain pending in the application, with Claims 1, 10, 11, 14, 17, 26, 29 and 35-37 being independent.

Claims 1-11, 13, 14, 16-26, 28, 29, 31 and 35-43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,029,182 (Nehab et al.) in view of what the Examiner terms “traditional client/server architecture”. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Nehab et al. is directed to a web site data retrieval system including computing equipment 1, such as a personal computer. Web printer 17 is an end-user application and is provided in computing equipment 1. Web printer 17 acquires personal-news-profile 19 from disk 5. The web printer generates a personalized newspaper based on the personal-news-profile and outputs the newspaper to printer 7 or display 2 via output interface 40. At column 5, lines 59-65, Nehab et al. makes clear that web printer 17 is part of the computing equipment 1. Namely, “[m]ain memory 14 interfaces with computer bus 9 so as to provide random access memory storage for use by CPU 8 when executing an application such as personal-news-profile editor 16 or web printer 17. More specifically, CPU 8 loads the software applications from disk drive 5 into main memory 14 and executes the software applications out of the main memory 14.” Nehab et al. does not send

the personal news profile to an external apparatus, and therefore cannot correspond to the claimed image forming apparatus. If it is presumed that the computing equipment 1 corresponds to the external apparatus, printer 7 or display 2 may acquire the personalized newspaper from the external apparatus, but does not send the personalized newspaper to the external apparatus. Therefore, printer 7 or display 2 cannot correspond to the claimed image forming apparatus. In modifying Nehab et al., based on typical client/server system architecture, the Office Action suggests that “the web printer itself 17 is the “external apparatus” which “receives” the locally personal news profile stored in the disk 5 of a separate host machine.” However, web printer 17 and disk 5 are provided in the same host machine (computer equipment 1) and there is no motivation for separating these two components. Moreover, at page 6 the Office Action suggests that the printer corresponds to the image forming apparatus. The printer in Nehab et al. does not include the sending unit or acquisition unit recited in Claim 1, for example.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that Nehab et al., even if modified by client/server system architecture, fails to disclose or suggest at least an image forming apparatus, which includes an output unit, and sends acquisition information and layout information to an external apparatus, as is recited in independent Claim 1. Nor does Nehab et al. disclose or suggest the corresponding features recited in independent Claims 10, 17 and 35.

As to independent Claim 11, Nehab et al. does not disclose or suggest that a portion of received layout information does not correspond to the function or state of an

image forming apparatus and another portion of the received layout information corresponds to the function or state of the image forming apparatus, and that the former portion is changed in accordance with the function or state of the image forming apparatus. As discussed previously, either the user-designated personal-news-profile or the default personal-news-profile is selected. If either the default or user-designated profile is selected, there is no disclosure or suggestion that a portion is changed in accordance with the function or state of the image forming apparatus. The selected profile itself remains the same. Accordingly, Nehab et al. fails to disclose or suggest important features of the present invention recited in independent Claim 11 or corresponding features recited in independent Claims 26 and 36.

Independent Claim 14 recites, inter alia, that the determination unit determines layout information in accordance with a function or state of the image forming apparatus if the print instruction is received without any layout information for the data. As noted previously, the user must edit the personal-news profile in accordance with the function or state of the image forming apparatus. Nehab et al. is not believed to disclose or suggest important features of the present invention recited in independent Claim 14, or corresponding features recited in independent Claims 29 and 37.

Thus, independent Claims 1, 10, 11, 14, 17, 26, 29 and 35-37 are patentable over the citations of record. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection are respectfully requested.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the present invention is patentably defined by independent Claims 1, 10, 11, 14, 17, 26, 29 and 35-37. The dependent claims are also allowable, in their own right, for defining features of the present invention in addition to those recited in their respective independent claims. Individual consideration of the dependent claims is requested.

Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejection set forth in the above-noted Office Action, and an early Notice of Allowability are requested.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark A. Williamson/

---

Mark A. Williamson  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 33,628

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3801  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

MAW/agm

DC\_MAIN 259902v1